DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendments
No claims have been amended.

Claims 1-22 are pending.

Response to Arguments

I.   Applicant's arguments, see Remarks filed 4/6/2009, with respect to the rejection of

claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore,

the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of

rejection is made in view of *Halliday et al* (US 5,880,740).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

II.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

III. **Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-15, 17-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
      unpatentable over *Bhagwat et al* (6,563,517) in view of *Halliday et al* (US 5,880,740).**

      a.   **Per claim 1,** *Bhagwat et al* teach a method for transcoding web-page content for a

limited-display computing device comprising the steps of:

a) upon receiving a web page request from a limited-display computing device, sending the web page request to a server computer that contains the requested web page document (*col.2 line 47-col.3 line 22, col.5 lines 12-23, col.13 lines 28-58-web request for webpage*);

b) receiving from said server computer a web page document that can be used to generate a display (*col.2 line 47-col.3 line 22, col.5 lines 30-50*);

c) searching said web page document for sequences of textual references to images (*col.5 lines 24-29, col.5 line 47-col.6 line 4*);

d) when said web page document includes more than one textual references to images, rendering each of the images represented by said textual references to generate a composite image (*col.6 lines 19-65, col.7 lines 1-62 col.12 line 13-col.13 line 10—webpage includes references for images*);

e) scaling each composite image rendered in step d) to meet the display requirements of said limited-display computing device (*col.3 lines 39-50, col.5 lines 19-59, col.6 lines 26-65, col.7 lines 24-41—provision for scaling images to meet the display requirements and capabilities of the client device*); and

f) sending each composite image scaled in step e) to said limited-display computing device (*col.4 lines 55-67, col.5 lines 12-23—sending scaled images to limited-display client devices*).

Although *Bhagwat et al* teach transcoding policies for streaming images and image segments based on the capabilities of the requesting client device, wherein an image transcoder waits to accumulate an entire input image before transcoding (*col.7 lines 15-24 and 57-62, col.12 line 13-col.13 line 10*); yet *Bhagwat et al* fail to explicitly teach searching said web page document for sequences of textual references directly adjoining each other, said textual reference refer to images when said web page document includes more than one textual reference directly adjoining each other. However, *Halliday et al* teach a web page with imbedded images in documents written in HTML using image zone identifiers and definition data referencing the

imbedded composite image of a web page document (*col.6 lines 25-67, col.8 lines 22-47, col.8 line 62-col.9 line 52*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* for the purpose of transcoding and linking directly-adjoining images from a webpage so as to generate a transcoded composite image with adjoining references; because this allows for the transcoding of an entire image by grouping the image segments in order to scale the composite image according to the display properties of limited-display device in order to properly render it on a limited-display device.

b.   **Per claim 2,** *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* teach the method of Claim 1, *Bhagwat et al* further teach wherein said web page document is written in a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) (*HTML: col.1 lines 52-58, col.3 lines 9-13, col.4 lines 60-63; Halliday et al—col.8 line 62-col.9 line 4*).

c.   **Per claim 3,** *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* teach the limitation of claim 2, *Halliday et al* further teaches wherein said more than one textual reference to images are directly adjoining vertically (*col.6 lines 25-61, col.8 line 62-col.9 line 41—image identifiers specify zone coordinates of the images to create the composite image*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* for the purpose of directly adjoining the images because this allows for vertically arranged segments/zones of the image to be grouped and joined together in order to properly reproduce the complete composite image on the limited-display device.

d.   **Per claim 4,** *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* teach the method of Claim 1, *Halliday et al* further teach wherein step d) further comprises: d1) when said web page document includes a formatting object that includes a plurality of the textual references, rendering each of the images represented by a textual references to an image that is disposed in said formatting object so as to generate a composite image (*col.6 lines 5-24, col.5 lines 13-27—data structure or table containing image identifiers*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* for the purpose of using a data structure such as a table to hold the textual references of a composite image because doing so efficiently organizes and groups all parts of the composite for ease of referencing and maintenance.

e.   **Claims 9, 18 (differ by statutory class, method vs. computer system) and 22,** contain limitations substantially equivalent to the limitations of claims 1 and 4, and therefore are rejected under the same basis.

f.   **Claims 10 and 19** claim subject matter equivalent in scope to the subject matter of claim 2 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

g.   **Per claim 5,** *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 1, *Bhagwat et al* further teach wherein step e) further includes reducing the bit depth of said composite image to meet the display requirements of said limited-display computing device (*col.5 lines 45-50 and 57-62, col.6 lines 39-65, col.7 lines 1-41*).

h.   **Claim 14** claims subject matter equivalent in scope to the subject matter of claim 5 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

i.   **Per claim 6,** *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 1, *Bhagwat et al* further teach wherein said images rendered in step d) are rendered to an image size corresponding to the image size of a full-size display screen (*col.5 lines 19-23 and 39-50, col.6 lines 29-65, col.12 lines 2-6*).

j.   **Claim 15** claims subject matter equivalent in scope to the subject matter of claim 6 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

k.   **Per claim 8,** *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* teach the method as described in Claim 1, *Bhagwat et al* further teach wherein said limited-display computing device is selected from the group consisting of handheld computing device, a mobile phone, a pager, and an Internet appliance (*col.1 lines 43-45, col.2 lines 62-67*).

l.   **Claim 17** claims subject matter equivalent in scope to the subject matter of claim 8 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

m.   **Per claim 11,** *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* teach the method of claim 10, *Halliday et al* further teach wherein said formatting object is a table (*col.6 lines 11-24*).

n.   **Claim 20** claims subject matter equivalent in scope to the subject matter of claim 11 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

o.   **Per claim 13,** *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* teach the method of claim 9 wherein step d) further comprises: *Halliday et al* further teaches d1) when said web page document includes a sequence of textual references to images that are directly adjoining, rendering each of the images represented by said textual references that are directly adjoining so as to generate a composite image (*col.6 lines 25-67, col.8 lines 22-47, col.8 line 62-col.9 line 52; Bhagwat et al: col.7 lines 15-24 and 57-62, col.12 line 13-col.13 line 10*). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

teachings of *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* for the purpose of directly adjoining the images

because this allows for the different segments/zones of the image to be grouped and joined

together in order to properly reproduce the complete composite image on the limited-display

device.

IV.   **Claims 7, 12, 16 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over *Bhagwat et al* (6,563,517) in view of *Halliday et al* (US 5,880,740) further in view
of *Robotham et al* (US 6,704,024).

a.   **Per claim 7,** *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* teach the limitations of claim 6 as

applied above, *Bhagwat et al* teach applying the transcoding policies to text of a webpage (*col.6*

lines 19-20) but fail to explicitly teach the method as recited in Claim 6 wherein all of said web

page document except said images rendered in step d) are transcoded using a normal transcoding

process and are sent in step f) to said limited-display computing device. However, *Robotham et*

al teach using a transcoding process as applied only to text (*col.5 lines 1-35*). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

teachings of *Bhagwat et al* and *Halliday et al* with *Robotham et al* to transcode web content

except for images for the purpose of using other alternative encoding rules that are more efficient

for encoding images or transcoding only specific types of web content.

b.   **Claim 16** contains limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 7,

and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

      c.   **Per claim 12,** *Bhagwat et al* with *Halliday et al* teach the limitations of claim 10

as applied above, but fail to teach the method of Claim 10 wherein said formatting object is a

frame. However, *Robotham et al* teach making use of a frame and implementing a frame-buffer

(*col.9 lines 4-16 and col.19 lines 37-60*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Bhagwat et al* and

Halliday et al with *Robotham et al* to provide for the conversion processing, scaling, and

rendering of formatting objects such as frames, for the purpose of extending the method's

capabilities to other types of formats supported by web pages and not just text only.

      d.   **Claim 21** has limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 12, and is

therefore rejected under the same basis.

Conclusion

V.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's

disclosure: Nielsen (5897644), Fisher et al (7516403), Beach (7355608).

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the reference(s)
applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations
are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the
individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from
the Applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially
teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the cited passages as taught
by the prior art or relied upon by the examiner. Should Applicant amend the claims of the
claimed invention, it is respectfully requested that Applicant clearly indicate the portion(s) of
Applicant's specification that support the amended claim language for ascertaining the metes and
bounds of Applicant's claimed invention.

VI. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KRISTIE D. SHINGLES whose telephone number is (571)272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday 9:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kristie D. Shingles/
Examiner, Art Unit 2444